

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 are pending, with claims 1, 8, 15 and 16 being independent. Claims 1, 4, 8, 11, 15-17, 21 and 29-32 have been amended. Support for the amendments may be found in the application at, for example, Fig. 6, where the signal line driver 6021, which is between the first pixel portion 6010 and the second pixel portion 6020, represents one example of a driver circuit as is now recited in the claims. No new matter has been introduced.

Initially, applicant thanks the Examiner for the interview granted to the undersigned on May 16, 2006. The claims have been amended as discussed at the interview. For the reasons presented at the interview, which are also discussed below, these amendments are believed to overcome the current rejections.

Claims 1-14, 29 and 30 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Yamazaki (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0055384) in view of Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,466,292). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Yamazaki, Kim, nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests a driver circuit between first and second pixel portions, as recited in each of rejected independent claims 1 and 8.

As has been noted in applicant's prior responses, the rejection indicates that Yamazaki describes first and second pixel portions including first and second light emitting elements in Figs. 22 and 24. However, these figures are directed to two different embodiments (embodiments 8 and 10), and Yamazaki provides no indication that the light emitting elements of those two embodiments would be provided in a single device over a common substrate, as recited in claim 1. As such, Yamazaki nowhere describes or suggests first and second pixel portions on a common substrate with a driver circuit between them.

Kim, which the rejection relies upon for suggesting the inclusion of the light emitting elements of Figs. 22 and 24 of Yamazaki in a single device over a common substrate, is described as showing two pixel portions in Fig. 3. However, neither Fig. 3 nor any other portion of Kim describes or suggests including a driver circuit between the pixel portions.

Accordingly, since neither Yamazaki nor Kim describes or suggests including a driver circuit between pixel portions, any combination of these references also fails to do so. For at least this reason, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 15-28, 31 and 32 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Kim and Yamanaka (U.S. Patent No. 6,304,309). Like claims 1 and 8, each of independent claims 15 and 16 recites a light emitting device having a driver circuit between first and second pixel portions. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1 and because Yamanaka does not remedy the failure of Yamazaki and Kim to describe or suggest this aspect of the claims.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

The fee in the amount of \$120 in payment of the one-month extension fee is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/12/06



John F. Hayden
Reg. No. 37,640

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331